



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,082	12/27/2000	Elmer W. Jensen JR.	147	3268
7590	06/17/2004		EXAMINER	
Gerald K. Kita Rodel Holdings, Inc. Suite 1300 1105 North Market Street Wilmington, DE 19899			VAN DOREN, BETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/749,082	JENSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beth Van Doren	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2000.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20010330</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a non-final, first office action. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 15, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murthy et al. (U.S. 6,044,356).

3. As per claim 1, Murthy et al. teaches a system by which a customer determines ordering, manufacturing at a selected site and delivery without shipping of a tangible device sold by a seller, comprising:

a seller's computer receiving an order for a tangible device from a customer, selecting manufacturing process commands to manufacture the device as ordered, verifying that the site has the capability and an open schedule to manufacture the device as ordered, scheduling the manufacturing during the open schedule, and providing an order fulfillment schedule and tracking of the order (See at least column 1, lines 55-65, column 2, lines 50-67, column 7, lines 5-32, column 8, lines 40-65, and column 9, lines 1-20, wherein an order is received for a tangible device. Manufacturing process commands are selected from choices and it is verified that the site has the capability to manufacture. The manufacturing is scheduled and the order is tracked in the database),

a manufacturing control computer providing manufacturing process commands to a production unit at the site, the manufacturing control computer providing a site schedule and a record of maintenance fulfillment indicating capability and readiness of the production unit to manufacture the tangible device (See at least column 1, lines 15-30, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, column 8, lines 15-35, and column 9, lines 1-20, wherein a site schedule and a record of the capability and readiness of the production unit to produce the device is provided);

a production unit at the site adapted for manufacture of the tangible device substantially without human intervention upon direction of the manufacturing process commands supplied by the manufacturing control computer (See at least column 6, lines 15-46, column 7, lines 5-25, column 8, lines 15-35, column 10, lines 55-65, column 11, lines 55-67, and column 12, lines 1-20, wherein the device is manufactured substantially by the machines).

4. As per claim 4, Murthy et al. teaches a system wherein the manufacturing control computer comprises a manufacturing processes processor storing and retrieving information from a manufacturing process data base, and adapted for use by the seller's computer to verify the property interest of the customer in the production unit (See at least column 1, lines 15-30, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, column 8, lines 15-35, and column 9, lines 1-20, wherein information is retrieved and stored in a database and adapted to check the customer's interest in the production unit).

5. As per claim 5, Murthy et al. teaches a system wherein the manufacturing control computer comprises a supply chain fulfillment processor storing and retrieving information from

Art Unit: 3623

a supply chain fulfillment data base and providing a record of supply chain managers and a supply chain fulfillment report indicating completion of a supply chain instructions and the readiness of the production unit (See at least column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, column 8, lines 15-35, and column 9, lines 1-37, column 11, lines 30-45 and 55-67, and column 12, lines 1-6, wherein information is stored concerning fulfillment. Supply chain managers are known to the system. A report indicates the status of the supply chain).

6. As per claim 6, Murthy et al. teaches a system wherein the manufacturing control computer comprises a site schedule processor storing and retrieving information from a site schedule data base, and providing the seller's computer with maintenance schedule, a production schedule and an open schedule for the production unit (See at least column 1, lines 15-30 and 55-65, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, column 8, lines 15-35, and column 9, lines 1-20, wherein the schedule for a site is stored and retrieved including scheduling information).

7. As per claim 8, Murthy et al. teaches a system wherein the production unit comprises a maintenance fulfillment processor storing and retrieving information from a maintenance fulfillment data base, and adapted to provide a record of maintenance fulfillment (See at least column 1, lines 15-30 and 55-65, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, column 8, lines 15-35, and column 11, lines 30-55, wherein maintenance fulfillment (rework, changing the machine, machine repair) is recorded in a database and reported).

8. As per claims 11, 15, 16, and 18, claims 11, 15, 16, and 18 are process claims with equivalent limitations to claims 1, 5, 6, and 8, respectively. Therefore, claims 11, 15, 16, and 18

are rejected using the same art and rationale as applied in the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, and 8, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2, 3, 9, 13, 14, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murthy et al. (U.S. 6,044,356).

11. As per claim 2, Murthy et al. teaches a system wherein the production unit comprises a machine for producing the tangible device, the machine changeable for the specific ordered product (See at least column 1, lines 15-30 and 55-65, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, and column 8, lines 15-35, wherein a machine is used that is customizable to produce the specific product ordered). However, does not expressly disclose that the machine is a stereolithography forming machine.

Murthy et al. discloses a manufacturing process in which the tangible products produced have differing specifications to which the machine must change and adjust for production. It was known in the art at the time of the invention that a stereolithography forming machine was used to produce different objects using 3-D model specifications, the specifications varying by product. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a stereolithography forming machine in the machines used by the

manufacturers of Murthy et al. in producing products in order to more efficiently allocate resources through the consideration of the varying specification of products and the criteria associated with these varying specifications. See at least column 1, lines 1-30 and 55-65, and column 2, lines 13-30 and 45-63.

12. As per claim 3, Murthy et al. teaches a system wherein the production unit comprises a machine for producing the tangible device, the machine changeable for the specific ordered product (See at least column 1, lines 15-30 and 55-65, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, and column 8, lines 15-35, wherein a machine is used that is customizable to produce the specific product ordered). However, does not expressly disclose that the machine is an inkjet printer adapted to deposit droplets of liquid phase polymer.

Murthy et al. discloses a manufacturing process in which the tangible products produced have differing specifications to which the machine must change and adjust for production. It was known in the art at the time of the invention that an inkjet printer adapted to deposit droplets of liquid phase polymer was used to produce different objects with varying specifications. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include an adapted inkjet printer in the machines used by the manufacturers of Murthy et al. in producing products in order to more efficiently allocate resources through the consideration of the varying specification of products and the criteria associated with these varying specifications. See at least column 1, lines 1-30 and 55-65, and column 2, lines 13-30 and 45-63.

13. As per claim 9, Murthy et al. teaches a system wherein the seller's computer comprises a device attributes processor storing and retrieving information from a device attributes database and adapted to provide a user with numerous tangible devices for selection by the user according to the device attributes (See at least column 1, lines 15-30, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, and column 11, lines 30-55, wherein devices are considered and selected based on attributes). However, Murthy et al. does not expressly disclose that the customer selects the devices.

Murthy et al. discusses that the user chooses the devices in the solution options and the solution chosen, with its associated plan and schedule, will have effects on the customer, such as delays, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the customer instead of the user to choose the devices in order to more efficiently meet the needs and requirements of the customers, thus increasing customer retention. See at least column 2, lines 50-67.

14. As per claims 12 and 19, claims 12 and 19 are process claims with equivalent limitations to claims 2 and 9, respectively. Therefore, claims 2 and 9 are rejected using the same art and rationale as applied in the rejection of claims 12 and 19, respectively.

15. As per claim 13, Murthy et al. teaches a process wherein, the step of manufacturing the tangible device substantially without human intervention further includes the step of using a machine for producing the tangible device, the machine changeable for the specific ordered product (See at least column 1, lines 15-30 and 55-65, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, and column 8, lines 15-35, wherein a machine is used that is customizable to produce the specific

product ordered). However, does not expressly disclose that the machine uses successive molecular deposition onto an area pattern.

Murthy et al. discloses a manufacturing process in which the tangible products produced have differing specifications to which the machine must change and adjust for production. It was known in the art at the time of the invention that using successive molecular deposition onto an area pattern was used to produce different objects with varying specifications. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include using successive molecular deposition onto an area pattern in the machines used by the manufacturers of Murthy et al. in producing products in order to more efficiently allocate resources through the consideration of the varying specification of products and the criteria associated with these varying specifications. See at least column 1, lines 1-30 and 55-65, and column 2, lines 13-30 and 45-63.

16. As per claim 14, Murthy et al. teaches a process further including the steps of verifying the property interest of the customer in the production unit, and apportioning according to the property interest of the user the income, depreciation, financial accounting adjustments, etc. (See at least column 1, lines 15-30, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, column 8, lines 15-35, and column 9, lines 1-20, wherein information is retrieved and stored in a database and adapted to check the customer's interest in the production unit. See at least column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, and column 10, lines 1-30, which discloses the interest of the user and the apportioning according to the user's interest with respect to income, depreciation, financial accounting, etc.). However, Murthy et al. does not expressly disclose apportioning according to the property

interest of the customer the income, interest, depreciation, taxes, insurance, and financial accounting adjustments.

Murthy et al. discusses that the user makes choices concerning the production plan, the solution chosen having an associated plan and schedule that effects the customer, such as production delays, etc. Income, interest, depreciation, taxes, insurance, and financial accounting adjustments were all known financial interests of a user at the time of the invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the customer instead of the user to make choices based on his/her interests in order to more efficiently meet the needs and requirements of the customers, thus increasing customer retention.

See at least column 2, lines 50-67.

17. Claims 7, 10, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murthy et al. (U.S. 6,044,356) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. 6,067,525).

18. As per claim 7, teaches a system wherein the manufacturing control comprises a production fulfillment processor storing and retrieving information from a production fulfillment data base (See at least column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, column 8, lines 15-35, and column 9, lines 1-37, column 11, lines 30-45 and 55-67, and column 12, lines 1-6, wherein information is stored concerning fulfillment). Furthermore, Murthy et al. discloses the delaying of orders and maintaining status information, such as scheduling, associated with the orders (See at least column 1, lines 15-30, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, column 8, lines 15-35, and column 9, lines 1-20, wherein a site schedule and a record of the capability and

readiness of the production unit to produce the device is provided). However, Murthy et al. does not expressly disclose that the processor provides the customer with an order tracking and order fulfillment report.

Johnson et al. teaches a processor that provides a customer with an order tracking and order fulfillment report (See at least figures 5, 21D and E, column 5, lines 50-65, column 13, lines 35-65, column 17, lines 39-65, column 18, lines 10-20, which discusses reporting the order status).

Both Johnson et al. and Murthy et al. disclose systems that allow customers to order products and schedule the production of the order and financial aspects associated with a customer placing an order. Furthermore, both Johnson et al. and Murthy et al. discuss the potential for a change in schedule related to the order's processing (for example, Murthy et al. may delay an order). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include providing the customer a report of the status and fulfillment of the order of Murthy et al. in order to increase the consumer-friendliness of the system by providing customers with information about the order the customer placed with the user, thus increasing the retention of customers.

19. As per claim 10, Murthy et al. teaches a system determining the property interest of the customer in the production unit (See at least column 1, lines 15-30, column 2, lines 13-30 and 50-67, column 3, lines 5-21, column 4, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 15-35, column 7, lines 5-32 and 50-65, column 8, lines 15-35, and column 9, lines 1-20, wherein information is retrieved and stored in a database and adapted to check the customer's interest in the production unit. See at least column 10, lines 1-30, which discloses the interest of the user). However Murthy et al.

Art Unit: 3623

does not expressly disclose that the seller's computer comprises a billing and payment processor and a billing and payment database verifying payment for the tangible device ordered by the customer.

Johnson et al. discloses a billing and payment processor and a billing and payment database verifying payment for the tangible device ordered by the customer at the seller's computer (See at least figures 5, 21D and E, column 14, lines 20-60, column 15, lines 5-30, column 17, lines 45-65, column 26, lines 1-30, wherein a billing and payment processor is disclosed after the customer places the order).

Both Johnson et al. and Murthy et al. disclose systems that allow customers to order products and schedule the production of the order and financial aspects associated with a customer placing an order. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a customer billing module in the system of Murthy et al. that allows customers to order products in order to more efficiently process the order by automatically receiving payment and verifying payment by the customer.

20. As per claims 17 and 20, claims 17 and 20 are process claims with equivalent limitations to claims 7 and 10, respectively. Therefore, claims 17 and 20 are rejected using the same art and rationale as applied in the rejection of claims 7 and 10, respectively.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Abelow (U.S. 5,999,908) teaches a product design computer system that interacts with potential customers to design and deliver products.

Parad (U.S. 5,369,570) teaches a computer system for integrated resource management in the scheduling of production.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (703) 305-3882. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bvd
bvd
June 10, 2004

T *R*
TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600